



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,432	12/30/2003	Charles R. Roe	BHCS:1006RCE	7856
34725 7590 09/16/2008 CHALKER FLORES, LLP 2711 LBJ FRWY Suite 1036 DALLAS, TX 75234				
EXAMINER				
POLANSKY, GREGG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1611				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/16/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,432

Applicant(s)

ROE, CHARLES R.

Examiner

GREGG POLANSKY

Art Unit

1611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 and 21-36 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 and 21-36 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant's response, filed 7/09/2008, to the Office Action mailed 6/09/2008 is acknowledged. Applicant canceled Claim 18, amended Claims 15, 21-23, and 30, and presented arguments in response to the Office Action.
2. Claims 15-17 and 21-36 are pending and presently under consideration.
3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive, in part. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: A method of suppressing the effects of translocase deficiency of a human infant comprising administration of a seven-carbon fatty acid.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 17 and 21-29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 17 recites "wherein said seven carbon fatty acid comprises the triheptanoin comprising **a triglyceride and 1 to 3 n-heptanoic acid fatty acids**" (emphasis added).

Triheptanoin "is a triglyceride made by the esterification of three n-heptanoic acid molecules and glycerol" (Specification, paragraph 70). It is not a triglyceride made by the esterification of **1 or 2** n-heptanoic acid molecules and glycerol.

The instant claim is indefinite because it is repugnant to the accepted definition of triheptanoin, and indeed the definition provided by the instant Specification.

Regarding Claim 23, the term "at least about" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear as to what range is covered. The claim lacks clarity as to whether "at least" (minimum) or "about" (broadening limitation, both higher and lower) control the metes and bounds of the phrase "at least about".

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 15-17 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter that was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a Written Description rejection.

The claims recite "seven carbon fatty acid selected from triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid or derivatives thereof". There is insufficient written basis for derivatives of triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid in the Specification.

Regarding the requirement for adequate written description of chemical entities, Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP §2163. In particular, *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert denied*, 523 U.S. 1089, 118 S. Ct. 1548 (1998), holds that an adequate written description requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, "not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention." *Elli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1566. The Federal Circuit has adopted the standard set forth in the Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under the 35 U.S.C. 112.1 "Written Description" Requirement ("Guidelines"), 66 Fed. Reg. 1099 (Jan. 5, 2001), which state that the written description requirement can be met by "showing that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics," including, *inter alia*, "functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure..." *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 296 F.3d 316, 1324-25 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (quoting *Guidelines*, 66 Fed. Reg. At 1106 (emphasis added)). Moreover, although *Elli Lilly* and *Enzo* were decided within the factual context of DNA sequences, this does not preclude extending the reasoning of those cases to chemical structures in general. *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 249 Supp. 2d 216, 225 (W.D.N.Y. 2003).

Applicant has failed to provide any structural characteristics, chemical formula, name(s) or physical properties of derivatives of triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid, aside from the recitation in Claim 15 that such are contemplated.

Therefore, it is not apparent that Applicant was actually in possession of, and intended to use within the context of the present invention, any specific derivatives of triheptanoin or n-heptanoic acid at the time the present invention was made. The skilled artisan could not "immediately envisage" the claimed compounds based on the description in the disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 15-17 and 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odle et al. (Journal of Nutrition, 1991, Vol. 121, pages 605-614; provided by Applicant), in view of Ajinomoto (JP 52015834A (provided by Applicant)) and Jandacek (US Patent No. 4,753,963).

Inhibition of mitochondrial β -oxidation of long-chain fatty acids, and its physiological effects, caused by a deficiency of acylcarnitine/carnitine translocase is well known by one of ordinary skill in the art (as evidenced by Kerner et al., "Genetic Disorders of Carnitine Metabolism and Their Nutritional Management", in Annual

Review of Nutrition, 1998, Vol. 18, pages 179-206). Odle et al. teach that changes in chain length within the medium-chain fatty acid family "may dramatically influence the rate and extent of digestion and/or absorption and metabolism of medium-chain triglycerides by neonates". One of the benefits of the medium-chain fatty acids is their "preferential oxidation because of less dependence on carnitine acyltransferase/translocase system for entry into the mitochondria. See abstract and 1st paragraph, page 605. Odle et al. disclose studies of medium-chain triglycerides containing unsaturated 7, 8, 9, and 10 carbon fatty acids. The reference suggests propionyl-CoA arising from the β -oxidation of odd-carbon fatty acid triglycerides (7 carbon more pronounced than 9 carbon) could diminish the hyperketonemia associated with medium-chain triglycerides. See 1st 11 lines, left column, page 606; and the 1st half of the right column, page 612.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to utilize the teachings of Odle et al. to provide to individuals suffering from acylcarnitine/carnitine translocase deficiency more readily absorbed and metabolized fats (i.e., triglycerides of medium chain fatty acids, particularly 7 and 9 carbon-chain fatty acids, such as "tri-7:0", a triglyceride of heptanoic acid (triheptanoin)).

Ajinomoto teaches an oral (enteral) triheptanoin nutritional supplement that includes triheptanoin alone, or in combination with proteins, oils, carbohydrates, vitamins and minerals. The supplement can include a beverage, such as milk. The reference discloses the composition is readily absorbed from the digestive system to supply calories without participation of insulin (insulin sensitivity is frequently diminished

in premature infants) and without producing excess ketones (also taught by Odle et al., *supra*).

Triheptanoin is metabolized by the body to three molecules of heptanoic acid and glycerol. Therefore, administration of a composition comprising triheptanoin is equivalent to administration of a composition comprising heptanoic acid, as required by instant Claims 16 and 31. Indeed, the instant Specification (paragraph 70) discloses the "terms heptanoic acid, heptanoate, and triheptanoin may be used interchangeably".

The cited references do not teach specific dosages of triheptanoin.

Jandacek discloses a nutritional fat suitable for enteral and parenteral products (see abstract). The fat disclosed by Jandacek consists of triglycerides having the following formula:



wherein each R¹ group is selected from n-heptanoyl, n-octanoyl, n-nonanoyl, n-decanoyl and n-undecanoyl groups; and the R² groups comprise from 0 to about 90% saturated acyl groups selected from n-heptanoyl, n-octanoyl, n-nonanoyl, n-decanoyl, n-undecanoyl, lauroyl, myristoyl, palmitoyl, stearoyl and mixtures thereof; from 0 to about 90% oleoyl groups; from about 10 to 100% linoleoyl groups; and from 0 to about 10% linolenoyl groups.

When R¹ and R² are selected to be n-heptanoyl, this formula results in a nutritional fat compound that is identical to triheptanoin. The reference is drawn to developing a nutritional fat in a form which is well absorbed by those persons such as

infants which have fat malabsorption problems (column 1, lines 45-48) (e.g., acylcarnitine/carnitine translocase deficiency). Jandacek teaches enteral compositions comprising the nutritional fat (triglycerides) disclosed in the reference, a source of carbohydrates, a source of amino acids and optionally, components such as vitamins and minerals. The composition can be formulated as a dry mixture or mixed with water to provide a fluid formulation for enteral administration. See column 5, lines 1-9. The amount of the triglyceride utilized in the composition is a nutritionally effective amount, based upon the subject and the nutritional benefits required. The composition typically comprises the nutritional fat (triglyceride) in an amount of about 2% to about 20% by weight of the composition (about 18 to about 180 calories per 100 grams of composition or about 4% to about 36% of the total caloric value of the composition). See column 5, lines 18-20 and column 7, lines 5-8. The reference discloses oral and feeding tube administration of the composition. See column 4, last paragraph. Jandacek also discloses parenterally administrable compositions. See column 6, lines 56-60).

As discussed *supra*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teachings of Odle et al., which suggest enhanced β -oxidation of odd-carbon fatty acid triglycerides (especially 7 carbon fatty acid triglycerides), to provide to individuals suffering from acylcarnitine/carnitine translocase deficiency more readily absorbed and metabolized fats. The artisan would have been motivated to find suitable compositions taught in the art. Ajinomoto teaches such a composition (triheptanoin) and further discloses its use as a suitable source of easily absorbed (fat derived) calories that do not require insulin for absorption (as would

be required by a carbohydrate derived source of calories). These two references would have motivated the artisan to utilize the teachings of Jandacek, selecting a triglyceride comprised of 3 n-heptanoyl groups (i.e., triheptanoin).

Conclusion

10. Claims 15-17 and 21-36 are rejected.
11. No claims are allowed.
12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGG POLANSKY whose telephone number is (571)272-9070. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30 A.M. - 7:00 P.M. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila G. Landau can be reached on (571) 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregg Polansky/
Examiner, Art Unit 1611

/Ardin Marschel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614